

REMARKS

Claims 13, 36, and 59 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 13-23, 36-46, and 59-102 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 13, 36, and 59 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema in view of Sitaraman.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 13, Huitema describes querying a local server to obtain the IP address of a remote computer. Sitaraman describes a DNS system in which each zone has one primary name server and one or more secondary name servers. The primary server gets its information from a file on disk, and secondary servers get their information from the primary name server. (2:37-41) Sitaraman teaches that to map a host name (e.g., john.rd.company.com) to an IP address, a query is sent to a local name server. When a local name server fails to find the desired records, it returns the name of the next local name server (2:55-3:21). However, neither Huitema nor Sitaraman teaches “retrieving the requested IP address from an object oriented database associated with the appliance”, “wherein the object oriented database comprises a first zone object associated with the zone, wherein the first zone object is linked to a second zone object associated with a sub-zone of the zone; and the zone and sub-zone are associated with a logically hierarchical set of zone information,” as recited in claim 13. Support for the amendment to claim 13 may be found, without limitation, in the above-captioned application at page 11, lines 3-14; page 12, lines 3-19; and Figure 6. Sitaraman does not describe that any of the servers retrieve information from an object oriented database. As taught by Sitaraman, the name server gets its information from a file on its disk (2:38-41). As such, claim 13 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 14-23, 70-78, 97, and 100 depend from claim 13 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 36 recites program code for carrying out the method of claim 13. Therefore, it is believed that claim 36 is also allowable.

Claims 59 recites a system for carrying out the method of claim 13. Therefore, it is believed that claim 59 is also allowable.

Claims 37-46, 79-87, 98, and 101 depend from claim 36 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 60-69, 88-96, 99, and 102 depend from claim 59 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10-5-2007


Clover Huang
Registration No. 55,285
V 408-973-2594
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014